

By Mr. DASCHLE:

S. Res. 212. A resolution to constitute the minority party's membership on the Ethics Committee for the 104th congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HELMS (for himself, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BURNS, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. LOTT, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. FRIST):

S. 1520. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham.

THE BILLY AND RUTH GRAHAM CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL AWARD ACT

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I have a bill that Senator FAIRCLOTH and I are joining to offer. It is sponsored by many other Senators. It is at the desk.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am not sure I understood what the Senator from North Carolina said. Was the Senator calling up a bill?

Mr. HELMS. This is a bill to authorize a congressional gold medal to Billy Graham and Ruth Graham, his wife of 52 years.

Mr. BUMPERS. Is the Senator calling a bill up for debate and consideration?

Mr. HELMS. No, sir, it is to be appropriately referred.

Mr. BUMPERS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before I begin, several Senators have already asked to be identified as cosponsors of this measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH; the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. SIMPSON; the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER; the Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI; the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON; the Senator from Kansas, Mrs. KASSEBAUM; and Senator ABRAHAM; and Senator SPECTER of Pennsylvania be added as cosponsors, and I ask that the bill be held at the desk until the close of business today for Senators to add their names as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, Senator FAIRCLOTH and I are genuinely honored to offer this legislation to award a congressional gold medal to two wonderful North Carolinians, Dr. Billy Graham and his remarkable wife of 52 years, Ruth Graham. I have known them for years. Billy Graham was born not far from where I was born, and I have known him very, very well since the early 1950's, when I attended his very

first crusade right here at the U.S. Capitol in Washington, DC.

When the bill is signed into law, Congress will be paying tribute to a deserving couple who have spent their lives exemplifying the miracle of America—faith in God, morality, charity, and family.

Most Senators have met the Grahams; many are personal friends, as are Senator FAIRCLOTH and I. Billy and Ruth are marvelous servants of the Lord. Anybody even vaguely familiar with the Grahams' witness will agree that Billy's and Ruth's relationships with God, their love for each other and their family, and their deep-seated compassion for humanity are unsurpassed. This is the genuine spirituality that has led literally millions of Americans, and millions of others around the world, to grasp the meaning and hope of salvation.

The incredible millions who have heard the message of salvation through Billy Graham's evangelistic campaigns are testimony to his devout magnetism. For the past half century, more than 100 million people in 180 countries have personally heard Billy Graham's thrilling messages in person when they attended his rallies. Others have worshipped with him by television. An estimated total of more than 2 billion people have worshipped with Billy Graham on television. Countless others have sought spiritual help and counsel through his books, magazines, newspaper editorials, radio broadcasts, and the Billy Graham Training Center at Black Mountain, NC.

The Grahams have responded to the physical needs of people around the world through a legacy inherited from Ruth Graham's father, the distinguished Dr. L. Nelson Bell, who was a missionary to China. Dr. Bell and his family served as medical missionaries to China for nearly 25 years before returning to the Memorial Mission Hospital in Asheville, NC.

Today, the Grahams continue Dr. Nelson Bell's legacy through the ministry of the Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Health Center where the children of western North Carolina and the surrounding area receive special medical care that was unavailable before the advent of the Graham Children's Health Center. Moreover, the Grahams, through their various ministries, have extended their love and their caring by extending their loving and helping hands to the victims of disasters, the medical needy, and the disadvantaged.

Mr. President, it is fitting and proper, I think, for the U.S. Congress to honor Billy and Ruth Graham, who if anybody ever has, they have earned not only the respect of the Congress, they have earned the keys to the kingdom.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, today Senator HELMS and I will introduce legislation that will authorize the Congress to present a gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham in honor of their contributions to mankind.

The striking of the medal will have no cost to the taxpayer. Most importantly, all of this effort will benefit children in southern Appalachia and internationally.

Ruth and Billy Graham stand as shining examples of faith, family, morality, and charity. These two great North Carolinians are truly servants of the Lord and His work has been further accomplished through their lifelong efforts.

Dr. Graham's crusades have reached 100 million people in person and over 2 billion worldwide on television. He is America's most respected and admired evangelist. His newspaper columns and books reach legions of people in need of spiritual counseling. And, his loving marriage of 52 years to Ruth Graham is a touching personal achievement.

The Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Center, located at Memorial Mission Hospital in Asheville, NC, is testimony to the difference they have made in lives of others. The center's goal is to improve the health and well-being of children and to become a new resource for ending the pain and suffering of children.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to quickly act on this honor for Dr. Graham and his wife. The prayers of many deserving children could be answered by this touching tribute to Ruth and Billy Graham.

By Mr. DOLE:

S. 1521. A bill to establish the Nicodemus National Historic Site in Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE NICODEMUS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ACT OF 1996

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, time, it is said, is the savior and nemesis of history. The savior because it is the very passage of time that creates history. The nemesis because that same passage of time obliterates history. Today, in Nicodemus, KS, a community is waging a losing battle against time. To bolster them in that fight, I am introducing legislation that would establish Nicodemus, KS, as a national historic site.

Kansas is not the first place that comes to mind when people think of the Civil War and reconstruction, but we Kansans know that Kansas is to the Civil War what Sarajevo was to World War I. Border ruffians, the sack of Lawrence, John Brown, and the Pottawatomie massacre are as familiar to Kansas schoolchildren as Fort Sumter and Gettysburg. The guerrilla war that rent bleeding Kansas was the opening skirmish in the armed conflict between abolitionist and slaveholder that ended at Appomattox.

Even less well known is that out of that bitter struggle emerged a period of hope for the newly emancipated. During the 1870's, Kansas was the scene of a great migration of southern blacks seeking their fortune in what some African-American leaders described as

the promised land. One of the most important settlements founded during that time was Nicodemus. From sod burrows carved out of the prairie by the original colonists, Nicodemus flourished into a leading center of black culture and society through the turn of the century.

Today, a cluster of five buildings is all that remains of that once vibrant community. National historic landmark status has not halted the gradual decay of this monument to the struggle of African-Americans for freedom and equality. In fact, in its report entitled "Nicodemus, Kansas Special Resource Study," the National Park Service indicated that "[i]f Nicodemus is not protected and preserved by a public or private entity, it seems inevitable that the historic structures will continue to deteriorate and eventually be razed." It was that finding that prompted my legislation granting the town of Nicodemus, KS, national historic site status.

It is my hope that colleagues will join me in working to save this unique piece of American history.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1521

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the town of Nicodemus, in Kansas, has national significance as the only remaining western town established by African-Americans during the Reconstruction period following the Civil War;

(2) the town of Nicodemus is symbolic of the pioneer spirit of African-Americans who dared to leave the only region they had been familiar with to seek personal freedom and the opportunity to develop their talents and capabilities; and

(3) the town of Nicodemus continues to be a viable African-American community.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to preserve, protect, and interpret for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations, the remaining structures and locations that represent the history (including the settlement and growth) of the town of Nicodemus, Kansas; and

(2) to interpret the historical role of the town of Nicodemus in the Reconstruction period in the context of the experience of westward expansion in the United States.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) HISTORIC SITE.—The term "historic site" means the Nicodemus National Historic Site established by section 3.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF NICODEMUS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Nicodemus National Historic Site in Nicodemus, Kansas.

(b) DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The historic site shall consist of the First Baptist Church, the St. Francis Hotel, the Nicodemus School Dis-

trict Number 1, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Township Hall located within the approximately 161.35 acres designated as the Nicodemus National Landmark in the Township of Nicodemus, Graham County, Kansas, as registered on the National Register of Historic Places pursuant to section 101 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470a), and depicted on a map entitled "Nicodemus National Historic Site", numbered 80,000 and dated August 1994.

(2) MAP AND BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION.—The map referred to in paragraph (1) and an accompanying boundary description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Director of the National Park Service and any other office of the National Park Service that the Secretary determines to be an appropriate location for filing the map and boundary description.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION OF THE HISTORIC SITE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the historic site in accordance with—

(1) this Act; and

(2) the provisions of law generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666, chapter 593; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—To further the purposes specified in section 1(b), the Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with any interested individual, public or private agency, organization, or institution.

(c) TECHNICAL AND PRESERVATION ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide to any eligible person described in paragraph (2) technical assistance for the preservation of historic structures of, the maintenance of the cultural landscape of, and local preservation planning for, the historic site.

(2) ELIGIBLE PERSONS.—The eligible persons described in this paragraph are—

(A) an owner of real property within the boundary of the historic site, as described in section 3(b); and

(B) any interested individual, agency, organization, or institution that has entered into an agreement with the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b).

SEC. 5. ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, exchange, or purchase with funds made available by donation or appropriation, such lands or interests in lands as may be necessary to allow for the interpretation, preservation, or restoration of the First Baptist Church, the St. Francis Hotel, the Nicodemus School District Number 1, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, or the Township Hall, as described in section 3(b)(1), or any combination thereof.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY OWNED BY THE STATE OF KANSAS.—Real property that is owned by the State of Kansas or a political subdivision of the State of Kansas that is acquired pursuant to subsection (a) may only be acquired by donation.

(2) CONSENT OF OWNER REQUIRED.—No real property may be acquired under this section without the consent of the owner of the real property.

SEC. 6. GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the last day of the third full fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the officials described in subsection (b), prepare a general management plan for the historic site.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In preparing the general management plan, the Secretary shall consult with an appropriate official of each of the following:

(1) The Nicodemus Historical Society.

(2) The Kansas Historical Society.

(3) Appropriate political subdivisions of the State of Kansas that have jurisdiction over all or a portion of the historic site.

(c) SUBMISSION OF PLAN TO CONGRESS.—Upon the completion of the general management plan, the Secretary shall submit a copy of the plan to—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Interior such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

By Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. EXON, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 1523. A bill to extend agricultural programs through 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, farmers, farm suppliers, farm credit agencies, and bankers are waiting. They need to know what the farm program will be in 1996. Every day that they wait for that answer is another day in which they cannot plan or prepare for planting the 1996 crops.

They are waiting for Congress to act, because the farm bill that was supposed to be debated and adopted in 1995 has not been debated nor adopted.

Congress has a responsibility to farmers to tell them what kind of farm program they will be operating under this spring. Farmers should not be the victims of the failure of Congress to enact a 5-year farm program. It was not their fault that a farm bill didn't get enacted on a timely basis.

We are rapidly running out of time. I would prefer a full 5-year farm bill that provides some fundamental reform to our current farm policies. I believe in providing a solid safety net for our Nation's family farmers, and making preservation and enhancement of our Nation's family farm system as the primary goal of our Nation's farm policy.

But we have not had a real opportunity to debate a multiyear farm bill. Nor have we had full and open hearings and committee meetings in which our Nation's farmers could effectively participate in the shaping of a farm bill. That should have been done last year, but it wasn't.

Today I am introducing legislation to provide a 1-year extension of the farm bill. I am pleased Senators DASCHLE and CONRAD have joined as cosponsors. This is not a perfect solution—but I hope it will get the ball rolling. Farmers deserve an answer about what the farm bill will be.

This bill extends our current farm law, including the Food for Progress program, conservation programs, and commodity programs for the 1996 crop year.

In addition, it provides the full flexibility that our producers have requested for permitted crops. The need for flexibility has been a common feature in almost all of the farm legislation that has been introduced and discussed this past year.

There is no reason why we shouldn't provide that flexibility this crop year, especially in recognition of the higher market prices that we are currently experiencing. This will allow producers to respond to the market signals, while maintaining the loan programs and the basic safety net available to them.

It also provides for forgiveness of advanced deficiency payments related to disaster and prevented planting situations. We need to recognize that the improved market prices do little for those producers who had short crops as a result of cropping problems this past year.

My purpose in introducing the bill today is simply to provide a vehicle for Congress to move rapidly to respond to the needs of farmers as they finalize their planning for this crop year.

I believe a 1-year extension should provide adequate time for Congress to get the farm bill job done. The delay in farm legislation has already been long enough. We should not delay it further.

If, instead of extending the current farm bill, we can on an expedited basis, debate and pass a new 5-year farm bill, then I'm all for it. But we shouldn't delay any longer. One way or another we should give farmers some certainty about the future farm bill.

Mr. President, I listened with interest to my colleague from Iowa. He is someone for whom I have substantial respect. The Senator from Iowa and I, in fact, are co-chairing one of the few bipartisan groups that exist in the Congress, and I am delighted to be doing that. I think he has a vast reservoir of knowledge on agriculture, and I have great respect for him.

I must say I disagree with some of what he just said. I disagree with the characterization of part of this debate. In fact I have sought the floor today for the specific purpose of introducing an extension for 1 year of the current farm bill. I will do that following this discussion.

I would extend the current farm bill for 1 year and make some modifications to it so that we would provide substantial planting flexibility. This is one of the features that the Senator from Iowa mentioned in the other legislation that was considered last year. I think there should be substantial flexibility with respect to any farm program, including the current farm program if it is extended for a year.

We need to give farmers the opportunity to decide what to plant, where to plant, and when to plant on base acres. My proposal to extend the current farm bill for 1 year would provide substantial additional flexibility in planting decisions for family farmers.

I would also propose that we provide a forgiveness for the advanced defi-

ciency payments for those farmers that suffered crop losses. That is also in the legislation that I offer.

The reason I offer this legislation today is not because I think it is necessarily the best choice nor it is my first choice for farm legislation. I hope to get the ball rolling here in the Congress to do something that gives farmers some certainty.

It is now the end of January 1996. A 5-year farm bill should have been agreed to last year. The Senator from Iowa mentioned, and he is absolutely correct, that the Congress had some hearings, and so on, and passed a bill. But Congress passing a bill with a majority of the votes in the House and the Senate is just a series of steps on a long stairway by which legislation becomes law.

That farm legislation was put in the budget reconciliation bill that everybody by last July knew was going to be vetoed. So the exercise to put their farm bill, called the Freedom to Farm Act, in the budget reconciliation bill that everybody knew was going to be vetoed puts us in a position in January of not having farm legislation today.

Again, I respect the notion that it is "his side" and "your side" and "our side" and "he said" and "she said." But the fact is, regardless of what happened last year, we end up in January in a situation in which farmers do not know under what conditions they will plant this year. The people who are selling farm machinery do not know the circumstances under which farmers will plant. All the other folks who are concerned about our rural economy do not know what the farm bill will be.

One way or another, it seems to me the Congress, Republicans and Democrats, need to provide an answer. What is going to happen this year when farmers go in the field? Under what conditions will they be planting a crop? What will be the support prices?

It probably does not matter much to the very largest operators. It certainly does not matter to the largest agrifactories in America. It does not matter to corporate farms, the big ones. But it does matter a lot to a man and wife on a family farm out there who are trying to raise a family and who have a very thin financial statement and who, if they come into a year of low market prices, have no price supports. It is not simply a matter of inconvenience. For them it is bankruptcy. It matters to them.

It does not matter to the big operators. They can get by. They can get by a year or two or three. It is the family farmer out there struggling from year to year, just one bad crop away from losing their farm. That is who is deeply concerned with this matter.

Now, what should we do? Well, I'll tell you my first choice. My first choice is for all of us to get together and come up with the best possible series of ideas that all of us have.

There should not be anyone in this Chamber who in a meeting between all

of us would not agree that farmers ought to have much more flexibility in planting decisions than they now have. All of us agree on that. So that is one step. Let us agree on that.

There are a number of other steps that we could agree on that would represent the elements of a new farm plan. But I will tell you one area where we will not agree. That is an area where we say that what we want to do is to build a stairway to Heaven. And, Heaven is described as a circumstance where after 7 years there is no safety net for family farms. That stairway to Heaven is not going to happen. It is a definition of Heaven I do not accept.

If you pull the rug out from under family farmers after 7 years there is no heavenly rescue. There is no real safety net. I am sorry but the fact is I wish to see yard lights in rural America. The only way family farm operators will be able to make it is if we have a real safety net when bad years come and international prices drop down and stay down. The only way we will retain a network of family farmers in this country is if we have that safety net.

Some say it does not matter who farms. If it really does not matter who farms, then the agrifactories will farm America from California to Maine. Then we will see what the price of food is. But it does matter for a whole series of social and economic reasons that we retain a network of family farms in this country's future.

How we do that? Well, we do that by writing a farm program. Have we had a very good farm program in the past? No, I do not think so. It is not the kind of farm program I would have written. But we are required to write a new 5-year farm plan.

The farm plan that was offered last year was put into the budget reconciliation bill. Incidentally, that is the first time this has ever happened. I think the Senator would concur with that. We have not previously taken a farm bill and said, "Oh, by the way, let's dump it into a reconciliation bill and let it travel along on that train."

That has never happened before. We have always done a farm bill in a separate debate, and then we moved it to the President and he signed it and we had farm legislation. But last year was different. It was put in a bill that everybody by June or July knew was going to be vetoed, and so it was vetoed, and we end up now at the end of January without a farm plan.

My first choice would be for all of us to get together and hammer out some compromise and say let us get the best of all ideas here and construct a farm plan that really does work for family farms.

If we cannot do that, in my judgment, why mess around at all? Our goal should be to try to help family farmers make a decent living when international grain prices collapse and stay down. If we cannot help them in those circumstances, I say get rid of the whole thing.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture was developed and started under Abraham Lincoln with nine employees—nine. Well, it has grown to be a behemoth organization, as all of us know, involved in the lives of farmers in some positive ways and in other ways in a negative way.

If we cannot construct new farm legislation that tries to provide a safety net for family-sized farms, get rid of it all. Shut down USDA. Get rid of the Secretary. Get rid of all the apparatus. Get rid of the program. I am not interested in developing a set of golden arches for the largest agrifactories in this country. They hold no interest for me. They are big enough to manage on their own. They can have their own celebrations when they make a profit. They can compete on their own in the international marketplace.

It is mom and pop out there on the family farm that cannot make it when international prices drop and stay down. They are the ones who lose their dream. All of us have had those calls. I had one not too long ago from a woman who was, with her husband, losing their farm. She began crying on the phone and saying that for 19 years they have tried to make a go of this farm. She said, "We do not go places on the weekend. We do not go out on Saturday night. Our kids wear hand-me-downs."

She said, "We are not people who spend money just for the sake of spending money. We save every dime we can."

"But," she said, "the fact is we are going to lose our farm, and it has been our dream. It is the only thing we have done since we got out of high school."

We have all heard those stories from people who are not just losing their farm, but they are losing their dream. The question now for all of us, it seems to me is what can we do? What can we do to help? What can we do to provide a safety net that works for family-sized farmers?

My first choice would be for us to find a range of agreement and pass a new 5-year bill that makes some sense. We would have to do that quickly, within a matter of weeks. I am certainly willing to engage in that process and would like to engage in that process. If we cannot do that, my second choice is to extend the current bill 1 year, provide substantial added flexibility and provide forgiveness of advanced deficiency payments for those who suffered losses. That would give us time. Then farmers could go into the fields to plant knowing under what conditions they are planting and knowing the kind of farm program they will have. This would give us time to wrestle again on a new approach of how do we construct a 5-year plan that will really work?

So I intend to offer today, for myself and a couple of colleagues, an extension of 1 year with some modifications, including substantial flexibility, and forgiveness of the repayment of advanced deficiency payments under certain conditions.

Is it the best approach? No, not necessarily. Do we need to provide some answers to farmers? You bet your life. It is not just farmers. It is everybody out there trying to do business. This Congress needs to take action and take action soon.

I hear people say, "Well, it is so and so's fault. It is somebody else's fault." That is not my interest. I am not interested in whose fault it is at this point.

My interest is how do we solve this problem in the next couple of weeks. I think that is what I heard the Senator from Iowa say as well. Let us figure out a way to do it for the farmers who live in Iowa and the farmers who live in North Dakota. For the family operators who are trying to make a living, let us figure out a way that we can answer this problem. We are required to do that.

It is not satisfactory to say, "Well, we passed a bill. That is the end of our obligation." If the bill got vetoed, it is not law. And that is what happened.

We do not have a farm bill. We must, it seems to me, struggle now to find a way to create one or to extend the current program in a way that will be helpful to family farms in our country.

It is interesting, people ask me from time to time, "What is a family farmer? You always talk about family farms. What is a family farmer?" I always say, "I don't know what the specific definition of a family farmer is." They asked Michelangelo how he sculpted "David." "I took a big piece of marble and chipped away everything that was not David."

I suppose if we just chipped away everything that we thought was not a family farm, we could come up with a core definition that we could probably all reasonably agree to on what a family farm is. But we do not have enough money for a farm bill to provide unlimited price supports all the way up the range of production. So let us define a family farm in terms of what we can afford to do to provide a reasonable safety net under a certain increment of production. That is what we attempted to do when we offered something called the Family Farm Security Act, and I think it made a lot of sense.

Some will say, "Well, that did not pass the Congress." That is true; it did not. There are often times when good ideas are not successful the first time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. The Farm Security Act is an approach that does say we are going to retool this farm program so that we are focusing on the people we want to help, the family-sized farm. It would provide a targeted marketing loan with the highest support price for the first increment of production. That is exactly what we ought to do, in my judgment. We were not successful in this past year in doing that. Somewhere in the context of reaching an agreement and in reaching a com-

promise, I hope some elements of that approach will be considered again.

But, most of all, those of us who come from rural States—Republicans and Democrats, the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from North Dakota, and others,—I think all of us have a responsibility now in the next couple of weeks to urgently press for the Congress and the President to answer the question for family farmers. When they start that tractor up and pull that plow out to begin spring's work in not too many weeks, under what farm program will they be plowing and seeding and harvesting?

It is pretty frustrating for people whose economic lives are on the line to see all of this rancor and all of this wrangling going on in the Congress when all they want are simple answers.

Tonight the President is going to give his State of the Union Address. Someone asked me today, a press person asked me, what do I think the President will say or should say? I said one of the things I hope he addresses, and I think he probably will, is this past year of 1995 when we have seen some of the most truculent, difficult debate resulting in policies that just defy all common sense, of shutdowns and threatened defaults and gridlock. I hope the message from everyone who will speak tonight, the President, who gives the State of the Union Address, and Democrats and Republicans who react to that address, will be it is time to have a New Year's resolution that all of us stop shouting and start listening. It is time we decide no one sent us here to advance the economic or political interests of the political party we belong to. They sent us here to advance the interests of this country.

This is a wonderful country with boundless opportunity and whose best days are still ahead of us, if we in this Congress can decide to do things that are positive for this country. That means a little less feuding and a lot more cooperation. I hope that is part of the speech tonight. I hope it will be. I hope the reaction to that is positive.

Part of that reaction, in my judgment, could be a reaction, even on agriculture and, yes, even on the farm bill, to decide what separates us is a lot less important than what unites us. What unites us in every State that we represent as farm legislators are families out there struggling against the odds to plant a seed that they do not know will grow into a crop. If they do get the seed to grow, they do not know what the price will be or if there will be a price to cover their costs.

Those twin risks are economic risks that can literally kill the dream of family farmers, and literally does kill that dream in tens of thousands of cases every single year. That is what we need to care about. That is the root and genesis of this debate about farm policy.

I know a lot of people do not think much about it and do not care much about farm policy. They think milk

comes from Safeway and butter comes from a carton and pasta comes inside cellophane. But it does come from cows and it comes from a wheat field and it comes from seeds and sweat. It comes from farmers breathing the diesel fumes as they plant and harvest.

This is a lot more important than just theory. This is an economic imperative in rural America that is important to many of us. I hope we can find reason to cooperate. I hope, as my colleagues will look at this piece of legislation, they will consider it. If not the extension of the current program, then let us consider something else that we can agree on that will advance the economic interests of farmers.

I do not share the notion that this in any way jeopardizes anybody's baseline. If it did, I would not be offering it. I am talking about the budget baseline, which my colleague will probably speak more about.

With that, Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for his attention and for staying. Again, I look forward to the cooperation that we have had on many rural issues. I hope we can cooperate on this issue as the weeks unfold.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the President. I thank my colleague from North Dakota for his excellent presentation on why it is critically important that we have a farm bill and that we have a set of rules that our farmers know will be in place as they enter into the next crop year.

Let me say that I believe the Senator from North Dakota has introduced something, that while not perfect, is something we are going to have to do in terms of extending the current farm bill so that farmers at least know what the rules of the road are going to be for this next crop year. There has been an absolute failure by this Congress to pass farm legislation that could become law.

Mr. President, the legislation that my colleague has introduced would dramatically increase the flexibility that farmers have and dramatically improve the competitive position of American farmers. I think that is in everyone's interest.

I think the Senator from Iowa is correct when he says that we need to know what farmers can expect. Farmers are right now sitting around their kitchen tables trying to figure out what their strategy for this next year should be, and much is at stake. Their families' livelihoods are at stake. What money the family is going to have for the next year is at stake. Whether or not that farm family is going to be able to meet their bills is at stake. The health of rural economies is at stake. What happens on the Main Streets of every city and town in the heartland of America is at stake.

The economic health of an industry that, along with airplanes, is the big-

gest producer of a trade surplus for America is at stake. An industry that is one of America's very biggest is at stake. Our competitive position in the world is at stake.

There is a lot riding on this debate and this discussion. The Senator from Iowa is right: We need a plan. Let me say what we do not need is the plan that the Republican Party has advanced in both the House and the Senate. The Republican proposal was for deep and Draconian cuts in farm programs that would dramatically reduce farm income. That has been their plan. Repeatedly Republicans have called for phasing out farm programs, for eliminating that support mechanism that has been the genius of American farm policy.

Mr. President, I believe that represents unilateral disarmament when we are in the midst of a fierce trade fight with other countries who recognize the importance of maintaining their competitive position in agriculture. The last thing we would do in a military confrontation is to engage in unilateral disarmament. Why we would ever do it in a trade fight is beyond me.

Make no mistake, we are in a trade fight in agriculture. Europe, which is our biggest competition, is spending three to four times as much as we are spending to support their agricultural producers.

Let me repeat that. Europe, our chief competitors, are spending three to four times as much as we are spending supporting their producers. Why? Because they understand the critical importance of agriculture to the economic health of their countries, and they do not intend to lose this trade battle. They intend to fight it. They intend to win it, and they think the United States is going to cave in. They think the United States is ready to roll over. They think the United States is ready to throw in the towel.

I have spent hours and hours with the chief trade negotiators for the Europeans, and they have done everything but draw me a picture of what their long-term strategy is. They believe the United States is losing its resolve to fight for agricultural markets, and they are going to win them the old-fashioned way. They are going to go out and buy them, and that is precisely what is happening. We would be fools to allow them to win this battle and see tens of thousands of jobs leave this country because we are not willing to fight.

Mr. President, let us recall what has happened with respect to farm policy this year. On the House side, they had a proposal they called "Freedom to Farm." Most of us would consider it "Freedom from Farming," because if that thing was ever put in place, there would be a whole lot of farmers forced off the land in very short order. It is not "Freedom to Farm," it is "Freedom from Farming." Others have called it "Welcome to Welfare," be-

cause what it did was to say that no matter what prices are, farmers would get a payment from the Federal Government for the next 7 years, and then we would wash our hands of farm producers in this country.

That proposal was so radical, it suggested we eliminate the underlying authority passed in 1938 and 1949 to even have farm legislation. That is how radical and how extreme the proposal was on the House side. They could not even get that proposal through the House Agriculture Committee, although it was authored by and offered by the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. They could not even get it through the relevant committee on the House side. Mr. President, that is how flawed that proposal was.

On the Senate side, they authored legislation that went through the Senate Agriculture Committee on a straight party-line vote after very little debate and very little discussion. Frankly, our colleagues on the other side did not want much debate, did not want much discussion, because they knew that policy was an invitation to liquidation. It would have cut farm support 60 percent in real terms in the seventh year of that proposal. I can just say, for my State, that would have represented an unmitigated disaster.

Interestingly enough, in the Senate, they did not even offer the House "Freedom to Farm" proposal for a vote. They did not even offer it for a vote, because they knew it would not enjoy much in the way of support, even in the Senate Agriculture Committee. So, then what happened, they came out on the floor and they stuck the farm legislation in the reconciliation bill.

What does that mean, "reconciliation"? It is confusing to people. That is where all of the programs are put together in order to meet the budget resolution requirements, and you do not have a separate discussion and debate on the bill itself. It is wrapped into a piece of legislation that contains many other issues.

They did that because they knew they could not pass their farm legislation on its own. Typically, the way we have handled farm legislation is to have a separate bill and a debate and a discussion on that bill and a vote on that bill. They did not want to do it that way. They wanted to wrap it in another package and vote on an entire package, with agriculture being just a small part of it, because they did not want people to be paying very much attention to what that farm policy represented, that was contained in that legislation.

Mr. President, that reconciliation bill was vetoed by the President of the United States. There were many reasons for his veto. There were many elements of that legislation, apart from farm legislation, that called for a veto. But part of the reason he vetoed it was the farm proposals, which the President saw as radical and extreme and as going too far and of putting the United

States at risk of losing the significant advantages it has had in competing for world agriculture markets.

The President of the United States was called on by farmers all across this country to veto that reconciliation bill, and veto it he did. I am proud the President did veto that bill, for reasons other than the farm legislation, but the farm legislation alone would have been enough for me.

I joined those farmers in asking the President to veto that bill. It was terrible policy. It represented unilateral disarmament in this world trade battle, a battle for markets that are critically important to the economic future of this country. It is not just the economic future of America that was at stake, not just our trade situation that was at stake. It was the lives of literally thousands of American farmers at stake.

Very often when I go home to North Dakota, I go to farm families and sit around the kitchen table and talk about the future of agriculture policy and what it means to that family. Over and over this year, farm families have told me, if the policy that is being voted on in Washington, that which was offered by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, ever became law, they would be finished, they would be out, they would be forced off the land.

I think the best estimate in my State is that we would lose a third of the farmers if that bill ever became law. That is not in the interest of family farmers. That is not in the interest of the economic health of my State. More broadly, I do not think it is in the economic interest of the country.

So I urge my colleagues to closely consider the course my colleague from North Dakota has proposed. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this summary action would not conflict with the goals of the two Senators from North Dakota who have just spoken, but is to point out where we are.

If, in fact, we have a year extension of the present farm bill, a couple things for certain will happen. First, immediately farmers will have to pay out of their cash flow last year's advance deficiency payment, because grain prices are higher now, at a time when some farmers did not get any crops and do not have that capability. If you have a 1-year extension, as opposed to the Freedom to Farm Act, money that would have gone from the Federal Treasury to the farm economy absolutely will not go.

So I do not quite understand why people on the other side of the aisle say that the "Freedom to Farm" agriculture bill is a sure, certain way to kill off the family farmers when their 1-year extension puts no money into agriculture whatsoever and the Freedom to Farm Act would.

What we get with the Freedom to Farm Act is certainty. We know in the bill that the President vetoed, albeit less money than has been spent on agriculture over a long period of time, we know the certainty of \$43.5 billion in agriculture programs over the next 7 years. That is \$6 billion to \$7 billion for 1996 that would go into agriculture that under the Democratic proposal that we have been talking about here in the last hour would not be going to agriculture.

That \$6 to \$7 billion next year, because of moving toward the marketplace for income from agriculture, will gradually decline probably to \$4 billion in the year 2002. But we know right now in the bill that the President vetoed that there would be \$43.5 billion going into agriculture. We know that it would be under contract to the individual farmers, and because of that contractual obligation, the same as the annual payment that goes for the Conservation Reserve Program being honored by subsequent budget decisions made by Congress, will not be changed. That \$43.5 billion is a sure thing.

Would my colleagues who promote a simple 1-year extension of the existing farm bill say that that 1-year extension brings certainty to agriculture? They are proposing something good for agriculture as opposed to what we Republicans propose of \$43.5 billion for certain to go into agriculture? That is what the President of the United States vetoed.

The other thing is, as we delay making decisions for agriculture with a 1-year extension, we are going to be delaying it until 1997. If you have a 2-year extension, you are going to be delaying it to 1998. The way the Congressional Budget Office scores anything in the budget, and as you apply that to agriculture, we could be losing baseline flexibility to do something for agriculture in the near future. We have already lost \$8 billion just because the President vetoed the farm bill. It is proposed by the House Agriculture Committee that if we have a 1-year extension, we could lose another \$6 billion from the baseline.

Now, for people on the other side of the aisle that want a 1-year extension of the farm bill, how can you say that you are helping agriculture if you are gradually chipping away at the baseline, the fiscal baseline for agriculture in our budget? You say you are a friend of agriculture, and you want to do that? That would not sell in my State to the very same farmers that my friends from North Dakota say that they talked to in the coffee shops.

The other is a simple extension of the 1995 farm bill for 1 or 2 years, which denies the reality of the international trade situation, the environment of the new GATT agreement, which this Congress approved a year ago. The GATT agreement is freeing up trade in agriculture and other commodities so that we are going to have a much more free-trading environment and an agri-

culture that tends to take more in 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002 than in the early years of the GATT agreement. But we are moving to a point where, by freeing up trade in agriculture, farmers are going to be able to get more money from the marketplace and less from the Federal Treasury. Where I come from, that is what the farmers want. They want to be able to compete. They know that with our efficiency in agriculture, we can compete, we will compete, and the provisions of the Freedom to Farm Act, besides nailing down \$43.5 billion from this transition from a Government-regulated agriculture to a free market agriculture, where we can compete in the world market, it also has the flexibility for the farmers to plant according to the marketplace, not according to the political decisions made here in Washington. That means that they are going to be able to plant the number of acres of corn or soybeans—those are the two prominent crops in my State—that fit the marketplace, the realities of the marketplace, not decisions that are made in the U.S. Department of Agriculture downtown by bureaucrats, who are removed from the realities of the marketplace that end up having farmers plant according to the historical bases that there are for corn and other crops on their respective farms.

What a way to make a decision in agriculture. Is that better than the market planting decision that can respond to the marketplace, a planting decision that fits into the reality of the freeing up of international trade, where our farmers can compete very well with any foreign competition?

The first thing is the \$43.5 billion. The second is flexibility to plant according to the marketplace. The third point is that we will no longer be setting aside our productive capacity that we have and letting acres of rich farmland lay idle from year to year. We are going to allow every acre to be planted so that we send a signal to all of our competitors around the world that we know there is a growing world demand for exports out there. We are going to compete in that, and we are going to produce to maximum to fill the demand of the marketplace. We are going to do that in a way that is not going to encourage any of the farmers of any of the countries of the world where productivity is not quite as good as ours to plow up their marginal farmlands and put it into productivity because they know we are taking some of our land out of production.

If there is anything about the freedom to farm proposal, it is the absolute certainty that is there. If there is anything about a 1- or 2-year extension of the present farm bill, it is the uncertainty over the period of transition to the free market and the new GATT environment in trade. Second, it is going to take, for certain, money from the farmers of America at the very same time that some of our colleagues are pleading the financial plight of those very same farmers.

So I think common sense dictates giving the farmers as much certainty as you can. They get that with freedom to farm. And it is absolutely not a part of a 1-year extension of the present farm bill.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, would you advise me of the present status of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I am a Senator who has been close to agriculture for a long time. I want to speak with regard to the remarks made preceding my statement by my farm State colleague from the State of North Dakota, Senator DORGAN, and likewise, my farm State Senator next door, CHUCK GRASSLEY, who both are Senators I have worked with for a long time on farm policy.

I think we have an awful lot to do in this particular area. The most significant concern that I have in this regard, Mr. President, is the fact that here we are dilly-dallying on a farm program, and the farmers across the United States of America are justifiably concerned. Many in the South are beginning to plant now. The grain crop farmers in Nebraska and the rest of the major grain-producing States are now preparing to plant. They are trying to work out their financial needs with their bankers. They are totally at a loss and do not know what we are going to do.

I suggest that never before in history have we been so late in deciding what a farm program is going to be in the year that the crop is going to be planted. That has to stop. I do not know how to end this impasse that we have but the impasse must be broken for the good of the food producers of the United States of America.

I happen to feel that probably the best way to resolve this matter in an expeditious fashion, if we could reach an agreement between the two leaders in the Senate to bring up a freestanding farm bill with some kind of restrained debate, something to move things along and then have an up-or-down vote. That would be one way to solve the problem and let the Senate work its will. Whether that is possible or not I do not know at this juncture, but I know that is one of the suggestions that are being mulled over.

The initiative by the Senator from North Dakota today to essentially extend the present farm program for 1 year is not the best of all worlds but it is a whole lot better than no action whatever.

I must say that I have studied with great interest the so-called Freedom to Farm Act and I understand that the sponsors of that measure over on the House side, as the House has the penchant for these days is to say, "Do it our way or we will not do it at all." That is not the way which you handle farm

policy or the way we should handle the budget. Certainly, we have 435 Members of the House of Representatives and 100 of us here in the U.S. Senate. We have an obligation to work our will, using the procedures that are in place in both bodies, and we cannot have some people, one, two, or three individuals, say "Doing it my way is the only way, and I will not do anything unless you do it my way."

It is not the way to get things done or accomplish anything in a body where you have 435 over there and 100 of us over here, 535 all strongly willed individuals with their own ideas. I suppose it would be self-serving to say, Mr. President, that maybe I should say 534 because the Chair and everybody in the Senate knows this Senator from Nebraska is not a strong-willed individual. I set myself apart from all of the other Members.

With that facetious statement, I come back to the core issue here, and that is we have got to move. I cannot support the so-called Freedom to Farm Act in its present form. Certainly, the Freedom to Farm Act eliminates a great deal of the red tape. It gives the farmers what I like to see them have and what they want. That is to make decisions on their own about where they plant and how they plant it.

That concept is also basically included in a measure that was introduced by the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, another farm State senator, myself, and my colleague, Senator KERREY from Nebraska, and others, known as the Democratic farm bill. It also incorporates all of those good features of allowing more flexibility on the part of the individual farmer, eliminates a lot of the red tape but does not go as far into what I think is making the farm program a welfare program, as I am very fearful the Freedom to Farm Act would eventually encounter.

Let me cite an example, and I will ask at the appropriate time that the facts be printed in the RECORD. As a farm State Senator who recognizes that our prediction of many of our farmers today, especially those with limited acres on which they farm, continue to be in dire straits, I also cite today the fact that the cattle-producing industry is in deep, deep trouble today. While the Farm Act today or any of the Farm Acts we are talking about is not going to provide any relief basically for the cattle producer, they are part of the important food chain. I simply cite this as a fact. They are in deep, deep trouble today because of the steady decline in the cattle at all levels.

Coming back to the Freedom to Farm Act, I think that the main criticism I have of that act—and once the farmers of the United States fully understand it, I think that they would come out resoundingly against it because in essence it would turn the farm program into a welfare program which is something that they do not want. To

say that, Mr. President, and having said that I am a farm State Senator, have fought for good farm programs for a long, long time, I recognize they cost some money but I also recognize that the American public today spend less of their disposable income for food of any industrialized nation in the world. Food is a bargain primarily because of the good work, the production ability and the genius production of our family farmers going to make good food, clean food at more than affordable prices.

However, if we decouple completely the farm program from the marketplace we are marching down a road that I think farmers and the food industry eventually would come to recognize is a big mistake.

The welfare provisions in the so-called Freedom to Farm Act we all should know about, and I cite a typical example which is very accurate. Under the Freedom to Farm Act, which is a step down to phasing out the program in total in 7 years, as I understand it, we will take a typical farm and talk about typical farm, typical numbers. The facts of the matter are that as I indicated, the livestock industry, the beef industry in particular, the pork industry as well, are in deep, deep problems these days. If you go along with the Freedom to Farm Act, that will not be necessarily true of the row crop producers.

I cite, for example, if the Freedom to Farm Act became a reality and if we took, Mr. President, a 500-acre corn farm which is not a particularly big farm, not particularly little farm, but use that as an example, and if that individual farmer planted his 500 acres to corn, under the Freedom to Farm Act, and if that 500-acre farm produces 120-bushel yield, and if the price for corn were, for example, \$3.10 a bushel, 500 acres, 120-bushel yield, and a cash price of \$3.10, you multiply 500 by 120 bushels and come up with 60,000 bushels. And 60,000 bushels at \$3.10 cash price produces \$186,000 gross cash income. Not net, but gross cash income. In addition to that figure under the Freedom to Farm Act that same farmer would get from the Government, he would be paid, sent a check by the Government over and above the \$186,000 gross for 1996 using 60,000 bushels, he gets a 27-cent payment. That is \$16,200 in 1996 that typical farm would receive over and above the \$186,000 gross. In 1997, that goes up to 37 cents a bushel for \$22,200, which I think could be described as a welfare payment. In 1998, it goes up to 40 cents a bushel or a \$24,000 welfare payment.

I simply say that the example that I have used at the cash price of \$3.10 for corn producing for the farm that I have outlined, \$186,000 in gross cash income, on top of that the individual farmer would receive basically for doing nothing, or to put it another way, the 500-acre farmer with the ability to produce corn, assume that farmer planted nothing, he did not do anything, he just sat

and watched television all day long. Well, he would not get the \$186,000 but still under that kind of a scenario that farmer who planted nothing and did nothing would receive \$16,200 from the Federal Government in 1996, \$22,200 welfare-type payment in 1997, and \$24,000 in a welfare-type payment in 1998.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent the figures I have just referenced be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. EXON. I simply say that when you look at these kind of facts, I think one would have to conclude that any time you are going to have a welfare payment on top of what I have just outlined here at \$3.10 a bushel—I would add that even if corn went up to \$5 a bushel or \$8 a bushel, which I suspect it will not, but even if it should—under the Freedom to Farm Act, that typical farmer that I just outlined would still receive the \$16,000 to \$22,000 or \$24,000 depending on which year and so on down the road, on top of whatever he got from the marketplace. Therefore, there are dangers, because I happen to feel that when this information comes out, and with the stringent budget terms we are working under now, it would not be long before somebody would come up and say we are not going to do that anymore. Then some of the farmers who signed on to this program as some kind of a cash windfall would be hurt.

We have to have a farm program that gives the farmers some relief from what the situation is now with regard to the payback that they have to make for their advanced deficiency payments. But I think we can get together and work out a reasonable proposal and not one that is embodied in what is generally called the Freedom to Farm Act.

EXHIBIT 1

FREEDOM TO FARM

500 acre corn farm.
120 bushel yield.
\$3.10 cash price.
500 acres times 120 bushels equals 60,000 bushels.
60,000 bushels times \$3.10 cash price equals \$186,000 gross cash income.
Plus Government Payment (whether they plant or not).
1996—60,000 bushels times \$.27 payment equals \$16,200 welfare payment.
1997—60,000 bushels times \$.37 payment equals \$22,200 welfare payment.
1997—60,000 bushels times \$.40 payment equals \$24,000 welfare payment.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 969

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the names of the Senator from Maine [Mr. SNOWE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] were added as cosponsors of S. 969, a bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for a mother and child

following the birth of the child, and for other purposes.

S. 1039

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1039, a bill to require Congress to specify the source of authority under the United States Constitution for the enactment of laws, and for other purposes.

S. 1317

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1317, a bill to repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, to enact the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1995, and for other purposes.

S. 1364

At the request of Mr. KEMPTHORNE, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1364, a bill to reauthorize and amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes.

S. 1419

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1419, a bill to impose sanctions against Nigeria.

S. 1439

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1439, a bill to require the consideration of certain criteria in decisions to relocate professional sports teams, and for other purposes.

S. 1480

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1480, a bill to provide for the comparable treatment of Federal employees and Members of Congress and the President during a period in which there is a Federal Government shut-down.

S. 1519

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE] were added as cosponsors of S. 1519, a bill to prohibit United States voluntary and assessed contributions to the United Nations if the United Nations imposes any tax or fee on United States persons or continues to develop or promote proposals for such taxes or fees.

SENATE RESOLUTION 210—TO COM- MEND THE CORNHUSKERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

Mr. EXON (for himself and Mr. KERREY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 210

Whereas Dr. Tom Osborne, the winningest coach in college football, has led the Nebraska Cornhuskers to the last five Big Eight titles, a second perfect season, and repeat of the National Championship;

Whereas the Huskers have gone undefeated at 25-0 in the last two seasons and 36-1 in the last three seasons, the most victories ever in that time span for any collegiate team;

Whereas Tommie Frazier, the great Husker quarterback, continued the unmatched Nebraska tradition by being named Most Valuable Player in the last three Championship games and finished his brilliant career with a rushing high 199 yards in the 1996 Fiesta Bowl;

Whereas the Huskers decisively won the Fiesta Bowl becoming the second football team ever in collegiate history to earn a consensus #1 rank in the major polls for two consecutive years;

Resolved, That the Senate commends the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for having won the 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Football Championship.

SENATE RESOLUTION 211—TO COM- MEND THE CORNHUSKERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

Mr. EXON (for himself and Mr. KERRY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 211

Whereas the Cornhusker Volleyball team under the leadership and experience of Coach Terry Pettit has risen above all others in the volleyball arena;

Whereas Nebraska player Allison Weston was named co-winner of the national Player of the Year Award assisting her National Championship winning teammates in a spectacular season;

Whereas this year's Nebraska team was only the second east of California ever to win the Volleyball Championship Tournament by winning the title match;

Resolved, That the Senate commends the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for having won 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Volleyball Championship.

SENATE RESOLUTION 212—TO CON- STITUTE THE MINORITY PAR- TY'S MEMBERSHIP ON THE ETH- ICS COMMITTEE

Mr. DASCHLE submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 212

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on the Ethics Committee for the 104th Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], Vice Chairman;

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID]; and

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY].

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

•Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the